III. REMARKS

Claims 1-7 are pending in this application. By this amendment, claims 1 and 6 have been amended. Applicant does not acquiesce in the correctness of the rejections and reserves the right to present specific arguments regarding any rejected claims not specifically addressed. Further, Applicant reserves the right to pursue the full scope of the subject matter of the original claims in a subsequent patent application that claims priority to the instant application. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1, 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite regarding the use of the limitation "the respective node stations". In response, claims 1 and 6 have been amended to address the rejection.

Further, claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement regarding the use of the language "wherein said subset is made up of only one physical nodes of the network" (sic). (Note: in the previous amendment, submitted October 7, 2005, the term was amended to include "said subset is made up of only one physical node". i.e., a singular physical node.) In response, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection and contends that this limitation is adequately described in the specification. Applicant points to, *inter alia*, the specification regarding figure 1: "node identifier #1 stores the overall logical view of the network" (see ¶ [0018]) and, at the specification regarding flowchart at figure 5: "[t]he formation of a global mapping pattern in one or more particular devices has not been illustrated in this Figure. Such storing may be undertaken in a root node that is specifically adapted, such as in FIGS. 1-3. Storing in more than one node could be useful as well." (see ¶[0024]). Applicant contends this, *inter alia*, supports adequate written description for the cited limitation in claim 4: storing an overall network

topology in a subset that is made up of only one physical node of the network (i.e., storing an overall network topology in *one* physical node).

In the Office Action, claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as allegedly being unpatentable over Shima *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,366,964), hereinafter "Shima".

Applicant respectfully traverses the 35 USC 102(e) rejections because the rejection is improper for at least two reasons. Regarding claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that Shima fails to teach or suggest each and every feature as recited in claim 1, as amended. For example, Shima fails to teach, or suggest, a method that includes, *inter alia*, "marking **all** logical node mappings on the various physical nodes as invalid". (emphasis added).

To the contrary, Shima teaches a method that only *selectively* marks handle objects as invalid so that the amount marked is always *less* than the entire group. The Office cites the "Abstract" and columns 3, line 47-51, for support in making the rejection. A careful reading of those sections of Shima, and Shima in its entirety, indicates that Shima is only selectively making invalid certain discarded handle objects. Assuming *arguendo* that "handle objects" (Shima) are equivalent to "logical node mappings on the various physical nodes" (claim 1), Shima still does not mark *all* as invalid. For example, figure 4 in Shima, indicates at step 112 (i.e., "Change status of handle to invalid") only upon a "NO" answer to preceding query at step 110 (i.e., "Does next handle match any device?"). That is, Shima is only selectively changing status of handles to invalid, and not changing status of all handles. Further, other portions of the specification support figure 4: "*If* a device is removed, the handle object corresponding to that device is preferably never discarded, but is made invalid." (Col. 6, lines 16-18)(emphasis added). In sum, Shima only selectively marks as invalid those handle objects that meet certain criteria (i.e., those handles that are unmatched to a device). Accordingly, Applicant submits that there is

no disclosure or suggestion in Shima, of a method that includes "marking all logical node mappings [ ] as invalid", as in claim 1. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection.

With respect to dependent claims 2-7, Applicant herein incorporates the arguments presented above with respect to the independent claim from which the claims depend. The dependent claims are believed to be allowable based on the above arguments, as well as for their own additional features.

IV. CONCLUSION

In light of the above remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that all claims are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner require anything further to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 17, 2006

Joseph J. Christian
Reg. No.: 51,560

Hoffman, Warnick & D'Alessandro LLC
75 State Street, 14th Floor
Albany, New York 12207
(518) 449-0044
(518) 449-0047 (fax)